

United States Department of Defense

Inspector General



OFFICE OF THE OMBUDS ANNUAL REPORT

FISCAL YEAR 2010

March 22, 2011

Report Documentation Page				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.					
1. REPORT DATE 22 MAR 2011		2. REPORT TYPE		3. DATES COVERED 00-00-2011 to 00-00-2011	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Office of the Ombuds Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2010				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Department of Defense Inspector General, 400 Army Navy Drive, Arlington, VA, 22202-4704				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT Same as Report (SAR)	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 21	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			

TABLE OF CONTENTS



MESSAGE FROM THE OMBUDSMAN.....	3
METHODS	4
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
DATA POINTS	6
TOP 10 ISSUES (SUBCATEGORIES).....	6
CONCERNS WITH UPWARD SHIFT	7
IMPROVEMENTS	8
NARRATIVE	9
SAMPLES OF COMPLIMENTS	9
SAMPLES OF TOP 10 ISSUES	10
SAMPLES OF EMPLOYEE RECOMMENDATIONS	12
IMPACT	14
APPENDIX A - DATA TABLES	15
APPENDIX B - OMBUDS REPORTING CATEGORIES	17
CONTACT	21

MESSAGE FROM THE OMBUDS



SCOTT M. DEYO



INSPECTOR GENERAL
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
400 ARMY NAVY DRIVE
ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22202-4704



March 22, 2011

MEMORANDUM FOR ALL PERSONNEL


SUBJECT: Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2010

The Office of the Ombuds was administratively established on March 1, 2009 by then acting Inspector General Gordon S. Heddell, with the mission of being an independent, impartial resource that provides Department of Defense Office of Inspector General (DoD IG) employees worldwide with informal and confidential means of early dispute resolution. I am proud to serve as the first organizational Ombudsman for the DoD IG. In an effort to further professionalize the DoD IG Office of the Ombuds, on March 11, 2010 I became a Certified Organizational Ombudsman PractitionerSM by the International Ombudsman Association and was among the first cadre of professionals to receive this certification worldwide.

To provide a professional working environment that fosters commitment, excellence, and teamwork, it is DoD IG policy to promote the amicable and conciliatory resolution of internal conflicts, disputes and workplace concerns. To that end, this office receives concerns about alleged improprieties and systemic problems; helps analyze complex and difficult problems; serves as a feedback mechanism for organizational climate issues; and explores non-adversarial approaches for resolving concerns.

Pursuant to Inspector General Instruction 5100.1(F), I am pleased to present the second DoD IG Office of the Ombuds Annual Report for the reporting period October 1, 2009 through September 30, 2010. This report highlights major changes and accomplishments and provides a summary of issues presented throughout the reporting period in the form of metrics and narrative examples. I hope all DoD IG employees, managers, and senior leadership will find this report a useful tool to identify opportunities for positive change.

Questions may be directed to me by phone, 703-699-5637 or email, ombuds@dodig.mil.


Ombudsman

METHODS

The organizational ombudsman model is dynamic and flexible in that it offers multiple (and customized) conflict resolution business lines.

WHAT PROCESSES DO YOU USE?

Conciliation. Building a positive relationship between the parties to a dispute.

Negotiation. The fundamental process of dialogue between interdependent parties who seek to satisfy needs, interests, and/or find acceptable solutions to shared problems.

Mediation. A facilitated negotiation to allow parties reach an acceptable resolution of issues in dispute.

Shuttle Diplomacy. Serving as an intermediary between involved parties in dispute without those individuals being in direct contact with one another (e.g. a mediator “shuttling” back and forth).

Group Facilitation. A variety of techniques to help parties clarify goals, improve the flow of communication, and achieve specific group objectives

Partnering. Used to improve working relationships by seeking to prevent disputes before they occur.

Training/Education. Teaching the conditions that cause conflict and using experiential opportunities to learn practical skills for handling resolution in a respectful and positive way.

Conflict Coaching. Assisting individuals determine behaviors/actions that will help them reach their objectives as it relates to how they approach and resolve specific problems or overarching conflict.

Ombuds Climate Assessment. A process applied within larger groups that identifies shared interests, differences, problems and opportunities for resolution and/or positive organizational change. The climate assessment process continued to be used extensively during this reporting period. Regarding process, employees in specific organizations were asked three broad questions: what is working well (and why); what isn't working well (and why); and what changes should be made. While maintaining confidentiality, this method highlighted organizational successes, areas of concern, and solicited specific recommended changes to improve their Division, Component, and/or DoD IG as a whole. Further, it was a proactive way to bring issues to the forefront and allow leadership to address problems before they escalate.

HOW DO YOU TRACK WHAT YOU DO?

In April 2007, the International Ombudsman Association task force on database categories presented “Comparing Apples to Apples” at its annual conference. This presentation summarized the group's efforts over four years to develop categories and subcategories that Ombuds worldwide could use “to classify the kinds of issues, questions and concerns with which they are asked to assist.”

Their research was initiated by an underlying belief that “the capacity of a profession to represent the nature of its work to its own members and to others is a defining characteristic of its professional maturity.” Further, it was theorized that using consistent data would allow monitoring of concerns over time; standardize professional responses; identify training needs; consistently capture ombuds' work; and represent our experiences to colleagues and administrators. Regarding process, the task force researched, created preliminary categories, coordinated extensively (through surveys and interviews), benchmarked, and incorporated additional recommended changes from Ombuds globally. The DoD IG Office of the Ombuds adopted these uniform reporting categories, which may be found at Appendix B.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

MAJOR CATEGORIES



In fiscal year (FY) 2010, the Ombuds met with 325 employees: 66 (20%) individual employees and 259 (80%) that voluntarily participated in five organizational climate assessments. Employees are free to discuss the full spectrum of workplace concerns without attribution, and often share multiple issues.

Although the number of visitors increased by 100 (45 percent) from FY 2009, there was a 9 percent reduction in the number of issues presented (from 1055 in FY 2009 to 963 in FY 2010). Table 1 shows the number and percent of issues presented in fiscal years 2009 and 2010, to include the change by percent, or growth rate.

TABLE 1. Major Categories by Fiscal Year

ISSUES (Major Categories)	FY09		FY10		Change	
	#	%	# ▼	%	#	%
Mission, Strategic, & Organizational Concerns	342	32%	371	39%	29	8%
Supervisory Relationships	362	34%	285	30%	-77	-21%
Career Progression & Development	71	7%	139	14%	68	96%
Administrative & Customer Service Issues	64	6%	65	7%	1	2%
Colleague Relationships	93	9%	34	4%	-59	-63%
Safety, Health, & Physical Environment	24	2%	30	3%	6	25%
Values, Ethics, & Standards	60	6%	20	2%	-40	-67%
Pay & Benefits	14	1%	11	1%	-3	-21%
Policy, Legal, Regulatory, & Financial Compliance	25	2%	8	1%	-17	-68%
TOTAL	1055	100%	963	100%	-92	-9%

NOTE: Fiscal Year 2009 reflects a partial year, from March 1, 2009 (the date the DoD IG Office of the Ombuds was established) through September 30, 2009.

Concerns about the mission, strategy and organization moved up to the top major category this year, with the related subcategory “Leadership and Management” remaining as the top concern for a second year. Issues related to supervisors remain a priority concern, but fell to second with a 21 percent drop in FY 2010 (from 362 to 285). Employees who spoke with the Ombuds were concerned about how the work was accomplished (as related to timeliness and relevance of OIG work products). One observer noted this is an affirmative testament to our workforce’s dedication and commitment to making the DoD IG a world class organization.

There was a significant increase in the number of issues related to career progression and development (from 71 to 139, or 96 percent). A related subcategory focused on how positions were being filled (adherence to merit systems principles and alleged pre-selection). In FY 2010, we saw double digit reductions in the number of issues expressed about colleagues (from 93 to 34, or 63%) and values, ethics and standards (from 60 to 20, or 67% reduction).

The remainder of this report will focus on the issues by subcategory. Analysis and statistical summaries provided on the following pages are drawn from the full data set contained in Table 5 of Appendix A. Please note that metrics presented in this report only reflect the thoughts of those individuals visiting the Ombuds, and should not be extrapolated to reflect the entire agency.

DATA POINTS

TOP TEN ISSUES (SUBCATEGORIES)



Table 1 displayed the number of issues presented within each major category. Each of these major categories, however, have more specific subcategories. For example, the major category “Supervisory Relationships” comprises of supervisory behaviors such as reasonable assignments, providing constructive feedback, discipline, etc.

The chart below focuses on the top subcategories, which pull from a variety of major categories. Full data tables, which list all of the categories and subcategories, may be found at Appendix A.

Subcategory Title	No.
1. Leadership and Management	80
<i>Quality/capacity of management/leadership decisions, reassignments, reorganizations, etc.</i>	
2. Data/Methodology/Interpretation of Results	66
<i>Disputes about the conduct, outcomes and interpretation of studies and resulting data</i>	
3. Supervisory Effectiveness	54
<i>Management of component/division, failure to address issues</i>	
4. Career Development/Coaching/Mentoring	49
<i>Classroom, on-the-job, and varied assignments as training and developmental opportunities</i>	
5. Mission/Strategic and Technical Management	48
<i>Principles, decisions and actions related to where and how the organization is moving</i>	
6. Priority Setting/Funding	46
<i>Disputes about setting priorities and/or allocation of funding within programs</i>	
7. Job Application/Selection and Recruitment Processes	46
<i>Recruitment and selection processes; facilitation of job applications; short-listing and criteria for selection; disputed decisions linked to recruitment and selection</i>	
8. Communication (Corporate)	41
<i>Content, quality, style, timing, effects and amount of communication about strategic issues</i>	
9. Respect/Treatment	37
<i>Demonstrations of inappropriate regard for people, not listening, rudeness, crudeness, etc.</i>	
10. Communication (Managerial)	35
<i>Quality and/or quantity of communication</i>	

DATA POINTS

CONCERNS WITH UPWARD SHIFT

Table 2 displays the subcategories with the largest numeric increases from FY 2009 to FY 2010. This year there were six times the number of concerns expressed about “Data/Methodology/Interpretation of Results,” where employees cited relevant concerns 66 times (57 more than last year). Related examples include improper project planning, insufficient mentoring and functional training for junior professionals (to properly and independently carry out critical business processes), excessive top level reviews, and imbedded bureaucracy that halts seemingly straightforward matters (which results in final approval taking months rather than days).

There was a spike in the number of concerns about the job application/selection and recruitment processes (from 17 to 46, or 171 percent increase). The prevailing theme revolved around perceptions of pre-selection and alleged disregard for merit systems principles. The Ombuds was apprised 46 times (29 more than in FY 2009, or a 171 percent increase) of allegations where, by and large:

- Employees “knew” who would be selected;
- The job was advertised, but no interviews were conducted and selections were made;
- Interviews were a mere formality, with no structure or evaluation criteria used; and
- Positions weren’t even advertised and selections were made without interviews.

Employees were particularly concerned about situations where such “shoe-in selections” involved candidates from outside the DoD IG, and called into question selecting officials’ fairness and objectivity. Some individuals stated they understood that the agency’s hiring process and decisions may well have been legally correct and according to policy. (Those that alleged a violation were referred to the Director, Human Capital Advisory Services and Office of Professional Responsibility). However, using such flexibilities sent the following messages (intended or not):

- The full range of qualified candidates will not receive a fair and thorough review;
- Only the “favorite” would be selected;
- “Others need not apply” to future vacancies; and/or
- “The limits of your capability and upward mobility have been reached.”

The Director, Human Capital Advisory Services and Chair, Executive Resources Board, were advised of these concerns to consider and take actions they deemed appropriate.

TABLE 2. Greatest Shift in Concerns (FY 2009 to FY 2010)

Issues Subcategory	FY09	FY10	Change	
	#	#	#	%
Data/Methodology/Interpretation of Results	9	66	57	633%
Job Application/Selection and Recruitment Processes	17	46	29	171%
Career Development/Coaching/Mentoring	24	49	25	104%
Restructuring and Relocation	4	18	14	350%
Change Management	8	21	13	163%
Assignments/Schedules	13	26	13	100%

DATA POINTS

IMPROVEMENTS



Subcategories with the greatest numeric decreases from FY 2009 to FY 2010 are shown in Table 3. There were 29 fewer concerns about corporate communications. There were fewer concerns about the use and abuse of power/authority in the workplace, questionable business practices, and uncomfortable climates within the organization. Employees that visited the Ombuds in FY 2010 cited fewer problematic behaviors from supervisors. Specifically, there were marked reductions in the number of concerns about managerial integrity, professional conduct, reputation, treatment of subordinates, and communication.

TABLE 3. Greatest Improvements (FY 2009 to FY 2010)

Issues	FY09		FY10		Change	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Mission, Strategic, & Organizational Concerns						
Communication (Corporate)	70	20%	41	11%	-29	-41%
Organizational Climate	42	12%	17	5%	-25	-60%
Use of Positional Power/Authority	38	11%	17	5%	-21	-55%
Policy, Legal, Regulatory, & Financial Compliance						
Business and Financial Practices	21	84%	1	14%	-20	-95%
Supervisory Relationships						
Respect/Treatment	53	15%	37	13%	-16	-30%
Communication (Managerial)	51	14%	35	12%	-16	-31%
Reputation	24	26%	8	24%	-16	-67%
Climate	24	7%	11	4%	-13	-54%
NSPS-Related (Policy, Transition to GS)	24	7%	13	5%	-11	-46%
Colleague Relationships						
Reputation	22	6%	3	1%	-19	-86%
Communication (Colleagues)	18	19%	6	18%	-12	-67%
Respect/Treatment	22	24%	13	39%	-9	-41%
Trust/Integrity	12	13%	3	9%	-9	-75%
Values, Ethics, and Standards						
Professional Conduct/Integrity	29	48%	10	50%	-19	-66%
Values and Culture	18	30%	6	30%	-12	-67%

A large number of staff members gave credit to the Inspector General's emphasis on leadership training for supervisors, senior staff, and executives. In FY 2010, a total of 225 leaders attended leadership workshops, which shed light on specific leadership practices required for outstanding results. Employees whose supervisor or team leader attended these trainings noted significant improvements in their boss' leadership behaviors.

NARRATIVE

SAMPLES OF COMPLIMENTS



There were a substantial number of employees who saw improvements within the DoD IG during this reporting period. This section captures some of the positive behaviors and/or changes employees observed.

MISSION/SENIOR LEADERSHIP

- “OIG has an extremely important mission with high visibility”
- “Intense work but love it; very motivating”
- “Messages from IG very honest and candid”
- “Senior leader remembered my name and acknowledged my contributions”

MANAGEMENT

- Synonyms: “Fantastic; exceptional; flexible; honest; open; approachable; friendly; relaxed “
- “Trying to be more efficient; seeing products go out faster”
- “Managers nurture staff; trust and empower staff”
- “I saw positive changes when my boss came back from the Leadership Challenge”
- “We’re treated like professionals; empowered; given freedom to work”
- “Care about you as a person and a professional”
- “Making themselves more available; open door policy appreciated”
- “Really listens to our concerns; responsive”
- “Keeps everyone on the same playing field; more lateral than vertical; no ‘junior’ or ‘senior’”
- “Fosters a learning environment”
 - “We are able to have open dialogue; can present divergent ideas”
 - “My boss listens and respects me even when we disagree”
- “Weekly meetings are very informative”
- “Our boss always reports out meetings with the front office”
- “As a result [of above characteristic(s)], I’m more motivated and willing to go the extra mile”

MORALE/TEAMWORK

- “Physical fitness program made a huge positive impact on productivity”
- “Telework is supported; makes a huge difference in [the DC] area”
- “There’s a good work-life balance”
- “They mean what they say about family comes first; very flexible and understanding “
- “There’s a lot of internal cooperation behind the scenes”
- “Staff will go above and beyond for you”
- “Very seasoned and professional group with diverse experience”
- “Leadership Challenge was excellent”
- “New employee orientation was very informative”

NARRATIVE

SAMPLES OF TOP 10 CONCERNS

Ombuds hear the most unique, difficult, challenging, complex, and perplexing issues that organizations face. Employees anonymously bring forward unpopular, controversial, yet critically important problems to the attention of the Ombuds to help bring resolution informally. Here is a sample of those concerns.

1. LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT

- “What is our mission? What are our emerging issues today? What is our strategic plan?”
- “We have a mission and vision but what about an action plan?”
- “Upper management does not show trust or outward support; overly critical; rarely positive”
- “We don’t know our next project; research proposals are disapproved with no reason”
- “Mission has increased, but there are no new resources or billets”
- “The executive in our component is extremely rude and disrespectful to us and to customers; automatically says ‘no’ without consideration; this attitude permeates to other senior leaders and throughout the organization”

2. DATA/METHODOLOGY/INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS

- “We need to improve how we properly plan; need actionable projects”
- “We’re shying away from controversial findings; are there hidden agendas?”
- “Reports get edited by entire chain of command; originator not included or briefed”
- “We need to hold customers accountable for deadlines (with minimal extensions)”

3. SUPERVISORY EFFECTIVENESS

- “We talk about change but nothing happens; good ideas are dying on the vine”
- “Entrenched in ways of doing business; ‘We’ve always done it this way’ attitude; stagnant”
- “Not open to testing potentially more efficient methodologies”
- “Gripes should go across or up the chain; not shared with subordinates”
- “Team leaders are ‘quasi-supervisory’ and really need training in leadership”
- “Need a learning environment where diverse views are encouraged”

4. CAREER DEVELOPMENT/COACHING/MENTORING

- “Unequal grade structures for similar work across various divisions”
- “People are promoted too fast”
- “Mid-level folks are lost or forgotten; need an individualized career plan”
- “Going beyond compliments and alluding to future positions is crossing the line”
- “A select few are always chosen for travel and trainings; prepositioned to move up”

NARRATIVE

SAMPLES OF TOP 10 CONCERNS



5. MISSION/STRATEGIC AND TECHNICAL MANAGEMENT

- “How can you expect timely and relevant products when you add multiple layers of review?!”
- “There are no metrics in place to track the number of days in between each process phase”
- “Upper level reviews focus more on formatting/word choice than substance”

6. PRIORITY SETTING/FUNDING

- Widespread Downtime: “Junior staff are not assigned to projects immediately; staff are told to read policy manuals for “[3, 6, 9, 14] months”; some are working on research projects for “a year or more, which are often disapproved”; “there’s nothing to do when reports go through the chain for review (which can take months longer than the actual field work, and we ‘re not allowed to start a new project)”; “I just want to be productive”; “this is horribly wasteful”
- “Automatically says ‘no’ to more manpower/resources/training; very little overall support ”

7. JOB APPLICATION/SELECTION AND RECRUITMENT PROCESSES

- Favoritism / Pre-Selection: “Why are Directors allowed to hire their own people without interviewing?”; “We always know who will be promoted before announcements are made”
- “Promotions are given if you're eligible and you are liked; not if you have diverse views”

8. COMMUNICATION (CORPORATE)

- “Policies and standards are changed without feedback from the top”
- “Need more thorough activity reports (for internal Component info)”

9. RESPECT/TREATMENT

- “Any positive feedback is sandwiched between two negatives”; “Simple recognition is lacking”
- “Staff are chastised in front of others rather than behind closed doors”

10. COMMUNICATION (MANAGERIAL)

- “You only hear things through the grapevine”; “Some feel left out of the loop”
- “Information from the top doesn’t flow all the way down”
- “Sometimes receive conflicting directions from chain of command”
- “DO NOT USE ALL CAPS WHEN WRITING; it's like ‘yelling’ and unprofessional”

NARRATIVE

SAMPLES OF EMPLOYEE RECOMMENDATIONS

Employees not only discuss problems with the Ombuds, they generate new and innovative ideas that challenge the status quo. To help employees play a role in agency transformation, the Ombuds serves as an additional resource for employee engagement, motivating participation, leveraging knowledge, and addressing problems (or ideas) they would otherwise not reveal through normal channels. This section shares the anonymous suggestions provided to the Ombuds to help resolve their underlying concerns. These recommendations were shared with senior DoD IG leaders for information and appropriate action.

MISSION/LEADERSHIP

- Ensure all Component missions and goals align with the IG (and DoD) strategic plan
- OIG list of yearly priorities should mention something from all Components
- Expand the field more than headquarters
- Develop a uniform approach on how to do oversight
- As much as possible, provide underlying reasons for decisions and pass it along
- Invite and adopt innovative change; stop saying, "this is how we've always done it"
- Fully deploy desktop VTCs to the field; stop requiring field leaders to travel to headquarters
- When reviewing reports, focus on substance, not minor wording/formatting issues
- Rotate high visibility assignments to different people and different teams
- Need more effective debriefing/after action sessions to reflect and improve
- Provide justification for hiring decisions, to include process (panels, ranking system, results)
- Ensure new staff are substantively involved from day one
- Keep doing 360° reviews and Leadership Challenge course; saw major changes in manager
- Hold our feet to the fire for things under our control, but don't hold us accountable if the product sits on others' desks for months
- Don't delegate everything; take ownership over the issues and act
- Add an Executive Coaching resource internally; make a requirement for all SES
- Ask "what do you need from me to help you do your job?"
- Ensure fair rotation of who serves in the "acting" position when the leader is out
- Be more open to change; be more willing to shuffle up staff and fix broken processes
- Focus on interests, not just positions
- Say "good morning" and "hello" to employees by name when you see them
- Be more attentive to making people feel valued
- Assign note-taker at all staff meetings and all-hands; distribute and/or post on intranet
- Support a learning environment; its ok to disagree and provide different ideas

PROCESS IMPROVEMENT

- We have to give much more attention to planning phase
- Cut out layers of review for no or uncontested findings
- Coordinate work product reviews concurrently, not sequentially
- More rapid response assessments and memo reports
- Coordinate reviews of draft reports concurrently, not sequentially
- Use Lean Six Sigma (LSS) on all major processes in every DoD IG Component
- Have more than one team evaluate process improvement using different methods (not just LSS)
- Start implementing plans of action and milestones (POA&Ms)

NARRATIVE

SAMPLES OF EMPLOYEE RECOMMENDATIONS



ADMINISTRATIVE

- We need more timely, thorough and responsive service from our administrative support partners
- “We’re primarily auditors and investigators: provide as much info as possible to help us understand”
- Alternatively, admin support partners need more patience and professionalism from staff
- Start with a collaborative “lets figure out how to get to yes” stance rather than an automatic “no”
- List all of our training requirements, especially the mandatory courses, by FY/CY
- Ensure new employees have computers on the 1st or 2nd day
- Address inconsistencies with organization charts; include all components
- Provide more frequent and thorough updates on the BRAC Mark Center move
- Ensure the decision to telework rests with the first line supervisor; does not require SES approval
- If a policy changes, give us a short summary of what changed and how that impacts us
- If a procedure changes, let us know by email and post it on a shared drive
- Consider allowing career interns an opportunity to “appeal” proposed actions to SES
- Implement a new tracking system that has good reporting capabilities
- Formalize a program to rotate every two years
- Initiate more function-specific training
- Support professional development courses (i.e. classes that enrich but not specifically related to job)
- Convert contractors into government positions to increase accountability
- Make sure all job advertisements are forwarded to staff
- Find meaningful ways to improve administrative support to field offices
- Inventory staff’s knowledge and skills; capture electronically (i.e. SharePoint) for easy retrieval
- Centralize all like or related functions (i.e. procurement, training, edit) for oversight and consistency
- More emphasis on security (i.e. using special alert system for emergencies) and safety (elevate role)

POLICY CLARIFICATIONS

- **Fitness Program.** Section C of IG Instruction 6100.2, “Physical Fitness Program,” December 3, 2009, states “this Instruction does not apply to DoD IG part-time personnel, contractors, summer hires, or interns.” Some personnel participating in the Defense Career Intern Program expressed concerns about being excluded from participating. The following clarification was received from HCAS, “*The intern exclusion was not meant to nor does it apply to permanent employees in a career ladder program or the DCIP program.*”
- After a number of new staff stated they did not know the DoD IG was moving to the Mark Center, HCAS amended all vacancy announcements to include a statement about the BRAC move from Arlington to Alexandria, VA. Hiring managers were reminded to notify candidates and fully disclose this information about the move during the hiring process.

Table 4 displays the number (and percent) of impacts described to the Ombuds between FY 2009 and FY 2010, to include the numeric change between fiscal years. (The percent change between fiscal years was excluded to prevent misleading data.)

The 325 employees that shared their concerns with the Ombuds described 387 adverse impacts on them personally, on their team, component, and the mission. This is an average of 1.2 impacts per person for FY 2010; down from 1.9 average impacts per person in FY 2009. There was a tie for the number one impact: lowered morale and delayed/missed deadlines comprised of one third of the stated consequences of workplace concerns.

Employees cited 32 instances where they felt a manager/leader's handling of workplace matters (or not handling them) severely damaged his/her credibility. A similar number of consequences of workplace conflict were depicted as reduced collaboration with colleagues, decreased satisfaction with the job, quality problems, which often led to employee turnover.

TABLE 4. Stated Consequences of Workplace Concerns

KEY
INCREASES
ISSUES > 25
DECREASES

Increases in concerns are represented in red; decreases (or categories experiencing no increase or decrease) are shaded in green. Issues presented to the Ombuds more than 25 times are highlighted in yellow.

	FY09		FY10		Change
	#	%	#	%	#
Personal	152	36%	133	34%	-19
Lowered morale	62	15%	64	17%	2
Decreased job satisfaction	22	5%	27	7%	5
Increased Anxiety	34	8%	20	5%	-14
Defensiveness	17	4%	10	3%	-7
Reduced productivity	16	4%	9	2%	-7
Loss of sleep	1	0%	3	1%	2
Mission	100	24%	131	34%	31
Delayed and missed deadlines	22	5%	64	17%	42
Excessive employee turnover	16	4%	26	7%	10
Quality Problems	47	11%	25	6%	-22
Decreased customer satisfaction	15	4%	16	4%	1
Component	131	31%	100	26%	-31
Damaged management credibility	50	12%	32	8%	-18
Reduced collaboration	28	7%	29	7%	1
Distrust	26	6%	18	5%	-8
Hidden agendas	5	1%	7	2%	2
Negative upward attention	6	1%	6	2%	0
Split alliances	12	3%	6	2%	-6
Passive/aggressive behavior	4	1%	2	1%	-2
Professional	39	9%	23	6%	-16
Fault-finding and Blaming	21	5%	13	3%	-8
Increased supervision	10	2%	7	2%	-3
Fractionated activities	8	2%	3	1%	-5
TOTAL	422	100%	387	100%	-35

APPENDIX A

DATA TABLES

Table 5 provides the full number and percent of major issues and subcategories presented to the Ombuds between FY 2009 and FY 2010, to include the numeric change between fiscal years. (The percent change between fiscal years was excluded to prevent misleading data.) Similar to Table 4, increases in concerns are represented in red; decreases (or categories experiencing no increase or decrease) are shaded in green. Issues presented to the Ombuds more than 25 times are highlighted in yellow.

KEY

INCREASES

ISSUES > 25

DECREASES

TABLE 5. Issues (All Categories)

	FY09		FY10		Change
	#	%	#	%	#
Mission, Strategic, & Organizational Concerns	342	100%	370	100%	28
Leadership and Management	76	22%	80	22%	4
Data/Methodology/Interpretation of Results	9	3%	66	18%	57
Mission/Strategic & Technical Mgmt	46	13%	48	13%	2
Priority Setting /Funding	42	12%	46	12%	4
Communication	70	20%	41	11%	-29
Change Management	8	2%	21	6%	13
Restructuring and Relocation	4	1%	18	5%	14
Organizational Climate	42	12%	17	5%	-25
Use of Positional Power/Authority	38	11%	17	5%	-21
Division/Field-Specific	7	2%	16	4%	9
Supervisory Relationships	362	100%	284	100%	-78
Supervisory Effectiveness	52	14%	54	19%	2
Respect/Treatment	53	15%	37	13%	-16
Communication	51	14%	35	12%	-16
Equitable Treatment	30	8%	31	11%	1
Assignments/Schedules	13	4%	26	9%	13
Feedback	31	9%	25	9%	-6
Trust/Integrity	26	7%	18	6%	-8
Bullying	14	4%	14	5%	0
NSPS-Related (Policy, Implementation)	24	7%	13	5%	-11
Climate	24	7%	11	4%	-13
Priorities/Values/Beliefs	13	4%	6	2%	-7
Discipline	1	0%	5	2%	4
Reputation	22	6%	3	1%	-19
Diversity-Related	1	0%	2	1%	1
Insubordination	0	0%	2	1%	2
Retaliation	6	2%	1	0%	-5
Consultation	1	0%	1	0%	0
Physical Violence	0	0%	0	0%	0
Career Progression & Development	71	100%	138	100%	67
Career Development/Coaching/Mentoring	24	34%	49	36%	25
Job Application/Selection and Recruitment Processes	17	24%	46	33%	29
Career Progression	10	14%	13	9%	3
Rotation and Duration of Assignment	8	11%	12	9%	4
Job Classification and Description	2	3%	7	5%	5
Re-employment of Former or Retired Staff	3	4%	5	4%	2
Involuntary Transfer/Change of Assignment	5	7%	4	3%	-1
Termination/Non-Renewal	0	0%	2	1%	2
Position Security/Ambiguity	2	3%	0	0%	-2
Resignation	0	0%	0	0%	0
Position Elimination	0	0%	0	0%	0

APPENDIX A

DATA TABLES



TABLE 5 (cont'd). Issues (All Categories)

	FY09		FY10		Change
	#	%	#	%	#
Administrative & Customer Service	64	100%	65	100%	1
Responsiveness/Timeliness	32	50%	29	45%	-3
Admin Decisions; Interpretation/Application of Rules	22	34%	19	29%	-3
Quality of Services	10	16%	17	26%	7
Behavior of Service Provider(s)	0	0%	0	0%	0
Colleague Relationships	93	100%	33	100%	-60
Respect/Treatment	22	24%	13	39%	-9
Reputation	24	26%	8	24%	-16
Communication	18	19%	6	18%	-12
Trust/Integrity	12	13%	3	9%	-9
Bullying	8	9%	1	3%	-7
Priorities/Values/Beliefs	6	6%	1	3%	-5
Diversity-Related	2	2%	1	3%	-1
<i>Retaliation</i>	1	1%	0	0%	-1
<i>Physical Violence</i>	0	0%	0	0%	0
Safety, Health, and Physical Environment	24	100%	27	100%	3
AWS/Telework	7	29%	12	44%	5
Security	2	8%	5	19%	3
Physical Working Conditions	3	13%	4	15%	1
Cleanliness	2	8%	3	11%	1
Safety	6	25%	2	7%	-4
Ergonomics	0	0%	1	4%	1
<i>Work Related Stress and Work-Life Balance</i>	4	17%	0	0%	-4
<i>Safety Equipment</i>	0	0%	0	0%	0
<i>Environmental Policies</i>	0	0%	0	0%	0
Values, Ethics, and Standards	60	100%	20	100%	-40
Professional Conduct/Integrity	29	48%	10	50%	-19
Values and Culture	18	30%	6	30%	-12
Standards of Conduct	11	18%	4	20%	-7
Policies and Procedures (Other)	2	3%	0	0%	-2
Pay & Benefits	14	100%	12	100%	-2
Compensation	9	64%	12	100%	3
<i>Benefits</i>	4	29%	0	0%	-4
<i>Retirement, Pension</i>	1	7%	0	0%	-1
<i>Payroll</i>	0	0%	0	0%	0
Policy, Legal, Regulatory, & Financial Compliance	25	100%	7	100%	-18
Disability/Reasonable Accommodation	2	8%	3	43%	1
Privacy and Security of Information	0	0%	2	29%	2
Business and Financial Practices	21	84%	1	14%	-20
Accessibility	0	0%	1	14%	1
<i>Harassment</i>	1	4%	0	0%	-1
<i>Discrimination</i>	1	4%	0	0%	-1
<i>Criminal Activity</i>	0	0%	0	0%	0
<i>Intellectual Property Rights</i>	0	0%	0	0%	0
<i>Property Damage</i>	0	0%	0	0%	0

APPENDIX B

UNIFORM REPORTING CATEGORIES



1. COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS

Questions, concerns, issues or inquiries about the equity, appropriateness and competitiveness of employee compensation, benefits and other benefit programs.

- 1a. Compensation (rate of pay, salary amount, job salary classification/level)
- 1b. Payroll (administration of pay, check wrong or delayed)
- 1c. Benefits (decisions related to medical, dental, life, leave, worker's compensation, insurance, etc.)
- 1d. Retirement, Pension (eligibility, calculation of amount, retirement pension benefits)

2. EVALUATIVE RELATIONSHIPS

Questions, concerns, issues or inquiries arising between people in evaluative relationships (i.e. supervisor-employee, team leader-employee.)

- 2a. Priorities, Values, Beliefs (differences about what should be considered important – or most important – often rooted in ethical or moral beliefs)
- 2b. Respect/Treatment (demonstrations of inappropriate regard for people, not listening, rudeness, crudeness, etc.)
- 2c. Trust/Integrity (suspicions of dishonesty, whether or to what extent one wishes to be honest, etc.)
- 2d. Reputation (possible impact of rumors and/or gossip about professional or personal matters)
- 2e. Communication (quality and/or quantity of communication)
- 2f. Bullying, Mobbing (abusive, threatening, and/or coercive behaviors)
- 2g. Diversity-Related (comments or behaviors perceived to be insensitive, offensive, or intolerant on the basis of an identity-related difference such as race, gender, nationality, sexual orientation)
- 2h. Retaliation (punitive behaviors for previous actions or comments, whistleblower)
- 2i. Physical Violence (actual or threats of bodily harm to another)
- 2j. Assignments/Schedules (appropriateness or fairness of tasks, expected volume of work)
- 2k. Feedback (feedback or recognition given, or responses to feedback received)
- 2l. Consultation (requests for help in dealing with issues between two or more individuals they supervise or with other unusual situations in evaluative relationships)
- 2m. Performance Appraisal (job performance in formal or informal evaluation)
- 2n. Climate (prevailing behaviors, norms, or attitudes within a department for which supervisors have responsibility.)
- 2o. Supervisory Effectiveness (management of a component/division, failure to address issues)
- 2p. Insubordination (refusal to do what is asked)
- 2q. Discipline (appropriateness, timeliness, requirements, alternatives, or options for responding)
- 2r. Equity of Treatment (favoritism, one or more individuals receive preferential treatment)

NOTE: Additional information about the uniform reporting categories may be obtained from the International Ombudsman Association, which can be found online at www.ombudsassociation.org.

APPENDIX B

UNIFORM REPORTING CATEGORIES



3. PEER AND COLLEAGUE RELATIONSHIPS

Questions, concerns, issues or inquiries involving peers or colleagues who do not have a supervisory-employee or student-professor relationship (e.g., two staff members within the same department or conflict involving members of a student organization.)

- 3a. Priorities, Values, Beliefs (differences about what should be considered important – or most important – often rooted in ethical or moral beliefs)
- 3b. Respect/Treatment (demonstrations of inappropriate regard for people, not listening, rudeness, crudeness, etc.)
- 3c. Trust/Integrity (suspicions of dishonesty, whether or to what extent one wishes to be honest, etc.)
- 3d. Reputation (possible impact of rumors and/or gossip about professional or personal matters)
- 3e. Communication (quality and/or quantity of communication)
- 3f. Bullying, Mobbing (abusive, threatening, and/or coercive behaviors)
- 3g. Diversity-Related (comments or behaviors perceived to be insensitive, offensive, or intolerant on the basis of an identity-related difference such as race, gender, nationality, sexual orientation)
- 3h. Retaliation (punitive behaviors for previous actions or comments, whistleblower)
- 3i. Physical Violence (actual or threats of bodily harm to another)

4. CAREER PROGRESSION AND DEVELOPMENT

Questions, concerns, or inquiries about administrative processes and decisions regarding entering and leaving a job, duties, (i.e., recruitment, nature and place of assignment, job security, separation.)

- 4a. Job Application/Selection and Recruitment Processes (recruitment and selection processes, facilitation of job applications, selection criteria, disputed decisions)
- 4b. Job Classification and Description (changes or disagreements over required tasks, etc.)
- 4c. Involuntary Transfer/Change of Assignment (notice, selection and special dislocation rights/benefits, removal from prior duties, unrequested change of work tasks)
- 4d. Tenure/Position Security/Ambiguity (security of position, provision of secure contractual categories)
- 4e. Career Progression (promotion, reassignment, reappointment)
- 4f. Rotation and Duration of Assignment (requests for transfer, denied or involuntary transfers, etc.)
- 4g. Resignation (concerns about whether or how to voluntarily terminate employment, strategies, etc.)
- 4h. Termination/Non-Renewal (non-conversion to permanent, disputed separation from organization)
- 4i. Re-employment of Former or Retired Staff (loss of competitive advantages associated with re-hiring retired staff, favoritism)
- 4j. Position Elimination (elimination or abolition of an individual's position)
- 4k. Career Development, Coaching, Mentoring (classroom, on-the-job, and varied assignments as training and developmental opportunities)

APPENDIX B

UNIFORM REPORTING CATEGORIES



5. LEGAL, REGULATORY, FINANCIAL AND COMPLIANCE

Questions, concerns, issues or inquiries that may create a legal risk (financial, sanction etc.) for the organization or its members if not addressed, including issues related to waste, fraud or abuse.

- 5a. Criminal Activity (threats or crimes planned, observed, or experienced, fraud)
- 5b. Business and Financial Practices (inappropriate actions that abuse or waste organizational finances, facilities or equipment)
- 5c. Harassment (unwelcome physical, verbal, written, e-mail, audio, video psychological or sexual conduct that creates a hostile or intimidating environment)
- 5d. Discrimination (different treatment compared with others or exclusion from some benefit on the basis of, for example, gender, race, age, national origin, religion, etc.[being part of an Equal Employment Opportunity protected category – applies in the U.S.]])
- 5e. Disability, Temporary or Permanent, Reasonable Accommodation (extra time on exams, assistive technology, interpreters, or Braille materials including questions on policies, etc. for people with disabilities)
- 5f. Accessibility (removal of physical barriers, providing ramps, elevators, etc.)
- 5g. Intellectual Property Rights (e.g., copyright and patent infringement)
- 5h. Privacy and Security of Information (release or access to private or confidential information)
- 5i. Property Damage (personal property damage, liabilities)

6. SAFETY, HEALTH, AND PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

Questions, concerns, issues or inquiries about Safety, Health and Infrastructure-related issues.

- 6a. Safety (physical safety, injury, medical evacuation, meeting requirements for training and equipment)
- 6b. Physical Working/Living Conditions (temperature, odors, noise, available space, lighting, etc)
- 6c. Ergonomics (proper set-up of workstation affecting physical functioning)
- 6d. Cleanliness (sanitary conditions and facilities to prevent the spread of disease)
- 6e. Security (adequate lighting in parking lots, metal detectors, guards, limited access to building by outsiders, anti-terrorists measures (not for classifying “compromise of classified or top secret” information)
- 6f. Telework/Flexplace (ability to work from home or other location because of business or personal need, e.g., in case of man-made or natural emergency)
- 6g. Safety Equipment (access to/use of safety equipment e.g. fire extinguisher, gas masks, defibrillators, etc.)
- 6h. Environmental Policies (policies not being followed, being unfair ineffective, cumbersome)
- 6i. Work Related Stress and Work–Life Balance (Post-Traumatic Stress, Critical Incident Response, internal/external stress, e.g. divorce, shooting, caring for sick, injured)

7. SERVICES/ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES

Questions, concerns, or inquiries about services/administrative offices

- 7a. Quality of Services (how well services were provided, accuracy or thoroughness of information, etc.)
- 7b. Responsiveness/Timeliness (time involved in getting a response or return call or about the time for a complete response to be provided)

APPENDIX B

UNIFORM REPORTING CATEGORIES



7. SERVICES/ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES (CONT'D)

- 7c. Administrative Decisions and Interpretation/Application of Rules (impact of non-disciplinary decisions, decisions about requests for administrative and academic services, e.g., exceptions to policy deadlines or limits, refund requests, appeals of library or parking fines, application for financial aid, etc.)
- 7d. Behavior of Service Provider(s) (how an administrator or staff member spoke to or dealt with a constituent, customer, or client, e.g., rude, inattentive, or impatient)

8. MISSION, STRATEGIC AND ORGANIZATIONAL CONCERNS

Questions, concerns, issues or inquiries that relate to the whole or some part of an organization.

- 8a. Strategic and Mission-Related/ Strategic and Technical Management (principles, decisions and actions related to where and how the organization is moving)
- 8b. Leadership and Management (quality/capacity of management and/or management/leadership decisions, suggested training, reassignments and reorganizations)
- 8c. Use of Positional Power/Authority (lack or abuse of power provided by individual's position)
- 8d. Communication (content, style, timing, effects and amount of organizational and leader's communication, quality of communication about strategic issues)
- 8e. Restructuring and Relocation (broad scope planned or actual restructuring and/or relocation)
- 8f. Organizational Climate (issues related to organizational morale and/or capacity for functioning)
- 8g. Change Management (making, responding or adapting to organizational changes, quality of leadership in facilitating organizational change)
- 8h. Priority Setting and/or Funding (Disputes about setting priorities and/or allocation of funds)
- 8i. Data, Methodology, Interpretation of Results (scientific disputes about the conduct, outcomes and interpretation of studies and resulting data for policy)
- 8j. Interdepartment/Interorganization Work/Territory (disputes about which department/organization should be doing what/taking the lead)

9. VALUES, ETHICS, AND STANDARDS

Questions, concerns, issues or inquiries about the fairness of organizational values, ethics, and/or standards, the application of related policies and/or procedures, or the need for creation or revision of policies, and/or standards.

- 9a. Standards of Conduct (fairness, applicability or lack of behavioral guidelines and/or Codes of Conduct, e.g., Academic Honesty, plagiarism, Code of Conduct, conflict of interest)
- 9b. Values and Culture (questions, concerns or issues about the values or culture of the organization)
- 9c. Professional Conduct/Integrity (scientific or research misconduct or misdemeanors, e.g., authorship; falsification of results)

This report is available online at www.dodig.mil/ombudsman.
Additional information may be obtained by writing or contacting:

Department of Defense Inspector General
Office of the Ombuds
400 Army Navy Drive
Arlington, Virginia 22202



Scott M. Deyo, Ombudsman
703-699-5637 DSN 499-5637
ombuds@dodig.mil

